



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Apuleius: The Golden Ass. Being the *Metamorphoses* of Lucius Apuleius, with an English Translation by W. ADLINGTON, revised by S. GASELEE. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxiv+608. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

In forming an estimate of a translation, one usually asks how accurately and sympathetically the original text has been turned into idiomatic English. Such an inquiry would be out of place here, for of course Adlington's translation is not an accurate rendering, and revising it with a view to making it accurate would require a complete change in its character. The problem which confronted Mr. Gaselee, therefore, was to keep as much of Adlington as can be kept without departing too far from the meaning of Apuleius, and the question narrowed itself down largely to a matter of personal taste and judgment, and to a matter of judgment for almost every sentence of the translation. Consequently, the reviewer, while expressing no opinion here about the wisdom of undertaking such a task, has not only kept in mind the nature of the revision aimed at, but he has also tried to make a generous allowance for the difference between his judgment in a given case and that of Mr. Gaselee. Any two scholars may disagree about the wisdom of changing some word or phrase in Adlington which does not properly convey the idea of the original; they may not agree on the propriety or wisdom of changing an expression in Adlington which is not strictly grammatical or idiomatic, because of course even Adlington nods now and then. But there are certain requirements which one who revises Adlington's translation may fairly be called upon to meet. It is easy to see what we may properly expect of him. He should not insert a word in the revision out of keeping with Adlington's English, or a word or phrase which leaves us with an awkward or unintelligible sentence. He ought to correct Adlington, where Adlington has radically misunderstood the meaning of Apuleius. He ought to omit from his revision a clause or sentence in Adlington which is not found in Apuleius, provided it can be omitted without doing violence to Adlington's English, and he should insert a translation of any Apuleian clause which Adlington has omitted.

In all these respects the revision is open to criticism in many places. Only a few illustrations of the points mentioned need be given here. To cite some cases of the first sort, on p. 35 Adlington's sentence is revised so as to read, "I am brought me to the gate of this city"; on p. 51, "os quoquoversum

floridum," omitted by Adlington, is rendered "his blooming countenance in all points"; on p. 55 Gaselee revises Adlington's phrase "I was greatly delighted with the view of these things" to read, "I was greatly delighted with exploring the view of these things"; on the same page Apuleius' words "ceteros omnes sermone secreto decedere praecipit" appear in Adlington as "she willed secretly the residue to depart" and is revised to read, "she willed secretly the residue to depart from our secret conference"; on p. 59 we find in Adlington "with stirring and turning the same," in Gaselee "with such stirrings and turning the same"; on p. 63 the revision leaves us with an incomplete sentence, "O how well doth a fair colour and a brilliant sheen upon the glittering hair"! on p. 79 Adlington's "the Servitors waited orderly at the table in rich apparell" reads, "a crowd of servitors brought orderly the plentiful meats in rich apparel"; on p. 85 to Adlington's rendering "and am more quicke of sight than Lynx or Argus" is added "and must be all eyes," for the omitted phrase "et oculus totum"; on p. 89 "the Matron weeping with her witnesses" is made to read, "the matron all blubbered (= *flens*) with her witnesses"; on p. 49 stands the awkward and obscure revised sentence "the birds which I heard chirping, and the trees without the walls of the city, and the running waters were changed from men into such feathers and leaves and fountains."

In the way of mistranslations, it is difficult to see how the first sentence on p. 50 can be rendered as Gaselee translates it; on p. 54, in the phrase "inter medias frondes lapidis Actaeon," "lapidis" is not to be taken with "frondes" as Adlington and Gaselee take it, but with "Actaeon"; on p. 94 "populum adorat" means "addresses the people," not "made reverence unto the people," as Adlington and Gaselee translate the words; on the same page to render "praesentem audaciam" as "present audacity" is hardly correct; on p. 97 "being lively indeed, howbeit buried in sleep" misses the strong contrast intended in "vivus quidem sed tum sopore mortuus"; on p. 96 "praemium non industriae, sed debilitationis consecutus" means "after getting a recompense, not for his diligence but for his mutilation." Adlington had rendered the sentence with substantial accuracy "for lucre of a little money sustained losse of his members." Gaselee revises this to read, "for his diligence hath received no reward of money, but loss of his members." Of course Lucius did receive "a reward of money."

Two illustrations must suffice of cases where Gaselee has retained from Adlington clauses not found in Apuleius: on p. 87 Apuleius has nothing to correspond to "fell on the ground," and on p. 475 the sentence "there was no comfort in her, but continual weeping and sobbing" has been inserted by Adlington and should have been omitted in the revision. On the other hand, there are Apuleian phrases, like "certus erroris" on p. 163, which have been omitted by Adlington and could have been added in the revision, without breaking up the symmetry of Adlington's sentences. It is hard to understand at times how Adlington came to make omissions from the Apuleian

text or additions to it in his translation. We can understand why the prophet is made to put the magical herb "three times" (p. 93) on the lips of the dead man, although Apuleius speaks of only one application, but, for instance, why the entire sentence "Vos . . . perhibetote" (p. 84) or the two lines on p. 63 ("vel . . . aspectum") should have been omitted is not clear. The omitted passages have probably not been overlooked and are not generally difficult to understand. Perhaps we should be right in conjecturing that Adlington inserted or omitted phrases solely with a view to improve the style of the narrative.

Mr. Gaselee has shown excellent taste in retaining as much of the flavor of Adlington's version as possible. We question a little, however, the wisdom of not substituting "temple" for "church," on p. 251, and "comedy" for "fable" on p. 475, and of retaining such phrases as "committed this fact" (p. 91), "she had been stricken with some clap of thunder, *with some storm*" (p. 357), "an ass of arms" (p. 473), and "lapping up the end of the table-cloth into an heap" (p. 81). Perhaps one can best understand the nature of the changes which Mr. Gaselee has made in Adlington's version and appreciate the relation which the text of Apuleius, Adlington's translation, and Gaselee's revision bear to one another by glancing at a typical passage from the three books. Take, for instance, the sentence at the bottom of p. 86. In Apuleius it reads: "Terga vortit et cubiculo protnus exterminatur: nec mora, cum me somnus profundus in imum barathrum repente demergit, ut ne deus quidem Delphicus ipse facile discerneret, duobus nobis iacentibus, quis esset magis mortuus: sic inanimis et indigens alio custode paene ibi non eram." Adlington rendered this (see Whibley's reprint, p. 56): "Then incontinently she ran away, and when she was gon, I fell on the ground so fast asleepe, that Apollo himself could not discern whether of us two was the dead corps, for I lay prostrat as one without life, and needed a keeper likewise." In Gaselee's revision this sentence reads: "Then incontinently she ran away, and when she was quite gone from the chamber, I fell on the ground so fast in the deepest depth of sleep that Apollo himself could not well discern whether of us two was the dead corpse, for I lay prostrate as one without life, and needed a keeper likewise, and had as well not been there."

These misprints have been noticed: on p. 3, l. 15, "achieved" for "arrived"; on p. 41, l. 10, "it" omitted after "lay"; on p. 67, l. 26, "it" omitted after "now," and on p. 79, l. 21, "hits" for "pits." On pp. 94-95 the alignment is not accurate.

A revision of Adlington's translation called for the exercise of unusual care, and in closing this notice the reviewer feels compelled to express the opinion that Mr. Gaselee has taken his very difficult task too lightly.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT